Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao advocated the desirability of granting lands to poor people and more especially to those belonging to depressed classes at upset prices as it would be impossible for them to secure any lands for their use if they were put to auction.

The Dewan said that the suggestion regarding the grant of lands to poor people at upset prices would be noted for consideration.

SUBJECT No. 6.

Training of Patels in Revenue, Police and other matters.

Mr. H. Manjayya, Chennarayapatna Taluk.

Mr. H. Manjayya and *Mr. L. Vema Reddy* pointed out that Patels and Shanbhogs formed the backbone of the village administration and urged that it was therefore very essential in the interests of efficiency to arrange for there being properly trained in the various subjects which came up in their daily round of duties.

The Dewan said that the question of opening District Training Schools as an experimental measure would be considered.

SUBJECT No. 7.

Shanbhogs to be made responsible for the collection of revenue.

Mr. Thontarya, Devanhalli Taluk.

Mr. Thontarya said that, on account of the illiteracy of Patels in some villages, the Shanbhogs collected the *Kandayam* and maintained accounts, but the Patels were made answerable in regard to short collections, irregularities, etc. As this system was beset with inconvenience, he urged that until Patels became literate, Shanhogs might be made entirely responsible for the collection of revenue. He added that receipts were written by the Shanbhog, but the Patel had to attest it; and if the latter was not literate, there might be room for unjust action on the part of the Shanbhog.

Mr. Vema Reddy thought that no change in the existing system was called for. He was not for divided responsibility. There were competent hands among Patels and he thought there was no reason why they should not be made responsible for collection of revenue as heretofore.

Mr. B. Srinivasiengar said that the system followed in Mysore was neither on the Madras model nor on the Bombay model. He pointed out that according to the existing orders in Mysore, the Patel had to collect the money; but in most places it was the Shanbhog that attended to that work. There was therefore no reason why the receipts granted by Shanbhogs should not be considered as valid. Again, if the Patel collected the money, the Shanbhog must also be with him, to write receipts. As it might not be possible for both to attend to the collection work together, the work cannot go on smoothly. It was therefore necessary to define the duties of Patels and Shanbhogs and hold one person responsible for collection work.

The Dewan pointed out that the Rules of Madras were quite different, as the offices of Patels and Shanbhogs were not hereditary there but were held by full-time Government servants. He added that, in accordance with the Rules existing in Mysore, the Patels should alone collect revenue and grant receipts for the same duly attested by the Shanbhogs and that dual responsibility was undesirable. If any of the Patels were illiterate, they should be removed from the service.